FILED IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

## Dec 15, 2017

SEAN F. McAVOY, CLERK

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

5

6

23

8 KELLI GRAY, and all others similarly No. 2:09-cv-00251-SAB situated. 10 11 Plaintiffs, ORDER DENYING 12 PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR V. 13 SUTTELL & ASSOCIATES, et al., RECONSIDERATION Defendants. 14 15 16 EVA LAUBER, et al., Plaintiffs, 17 18 v. 19 ENCORE CAPITAL GROUP, INC., et al., 20 Defendants. 21

Before the Court is Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration, ECF NO. 614. 22||The motion was heard without oral argument.

Generally, motions for reconsideration are disfavored. See Carroll v. 24 *Nakatani*, 342 F.3d 934, 945 (9th Cir. 2003). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has 25 instructed that Rule 59(e) is an "extraordinary remedy" that should not be granted, 26 absent highly unusual circumstances. *Id.* Such circumstances include where the 27 district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed clear error, 28 or if there is an intervening change in the controlling law. *Id.* (quoting *Kona*) ORDER DENYING

## PLAINTIFFS MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION ~ 1

Enterprises, Inc. v. Estate of Bishop, 229 F.3d 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000)).

Plaintiffs have not demonstrated they are entitled to such extraordinary relief. They have not presented the Court with newly discovered evidence, shown that there is an intervening change in the controlling law, or convinced the Court that it committed clear error. More importantly, they did not challenge the Court's findings that permitting Plaintiffs to file a second amended complaint would substantially prejudice the Suttell Defendants.

## Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration, ECF No. 614, is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.** The Clerk of Court is directed to enter this Order and forward copies to counsel.

**DATED** this 15th day of December 2017.



Stanley A. Bastian
United States District Judge